DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 238 957 UD 023 083

TITLE	English as a Second Language, 1981-1982 (an E.S.E.A. Title I Project of the Boston Public School System). Final Evaluation Report.
INSTITUTION	Educational Planning and Research, Boston, MA.
SPONS AGENCY	Boston Public Schools, Mass.
PUB DATE	82
NOTE	56p.; For related documents, see UD 023 082 and UD 023 093.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Adjustment (to Environment); *Compensatory Education; Elementary Schools; Elementary Secondary Education; *English (Second Language); *Financial Problems; Limited English Speaking; Middle Schools; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS	Massachusetts (Boston)

ABSTRACT

Boston's Title I English as a Second Language (ESL) program (1981-82) was designed to provide supplementary ESL instruction to educationally deprived children in elementary and middle schools. The program's major objectives were to develop aural-oral English language skills in limited-English-speaking children, and to help them adjust socially and progress academically. The program as a whole was judged to be successful, with elementary school students mastering 77 percent of performance objectives, and middle school students mastering 84 percent. Pre-post test scores also showed overall gains, with middle school gains far exceeding the board program goal. The program was fully implemented even with the budgetary restrictions and personnel limitations that were imposed upon it. Although the program met its objectives, it was weakened not only by the reduction in staff but also by the assignment of teachers unprepared in ESL techniques. Only the program's strong momentum, resulting from 15 years of carefully developed materials, excellent direction, and well-established approach, allowed it to be so successful. (CMG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Project No. 82-035-134
Title I, E.S.E.A.

FINAL

EVALUATION REPORT

ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE

1981 - 1982

(An E.S.E.A. Title I Project of the Boston Public School System)

ED238957

UD 023 083

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

- This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Margaret M. Callahan
Boston Public Schools
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Submitted to:

THE SCHOOL COMMITTEE of
THE CITY OF BOSTON

and the
TITLE I
OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

Submitted by:

EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND RESEARCH

MARGARET M. CALLAHAN

Chapter I Program
26 Court St., 3rd fl.
Boston, MA 02108

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
	List of Tables	ii
1.	Description of the Program	1
	The Proposed Program	1
	Need for the Program	1
	Instructional Design	1
	Pupil Eligibility	2
	Program Administration	2
	Program Instruction	2
	Pupil Growth and Achievement - Elementary Levels	3
	Pupil Growth and Achievement - Middle Schools	3
	Program Evaluation	4
	Purpose of the Evaluation	4
	Evaluation Objectives	4
	Evaluation Procedures	4
2.	Process Evaluation Findings	6
	Program Structure and Implementation	6
	The Staff and Program Schools	6
	Pupil Selection and Preliminary Diagnosis	7
	Pupil Enrollment	7
	Pupil Attendance	9
	Observation Findings	11
	Instructional Methods	11
	Teaching Materials and Aids	12
	The Planning of Instruction - Lesson Plans	13
	Grouping of Children	13
	The Assessment of Growth	14
	The Keeping of Records	14
	Interview Findings	15
	Interviews with Administrators	15
	Interviews with Teachers	17
	Questionnaire Responses	21
	Responses of Administrators	21
	Responses of Teachers	22
	In-Service Training	23
3.	Product Evaluation Findings	24
	Appraisal of Growth	24
	The New York Rating Scale - Elementary Component	24
	The John Test - Middle School Component	25
	Performance Objectives	27
	Elementary Component - The Objectives	28
	Elementary Component - Achievement	30
	Elementary Component - Achievement by Levels	31
	Middle School Component - The Objectives	36
	Middle School Component - Achievement	40
	Middle School Component - Achievement by Levels	40
4.	Overall Summary and Appraisal	43
5.	Recommendations	47

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Pupil Enrollment by Grade - September through December 1981	8
2.	Pupil Enrollment by Grade - January through May 1982	9
3.	Pupil Attendance	10
4.	Improvement in English Competence - Elementary Level	25
5.	Improvement in Oral Proficiency - Middle Schools Gains by Grade Levels	26
6.	Improvement in Oral Proficiency - Middle Schools Gains by Program Schools	27
7.	Achievement of Performance Objectives - Elementary Component	31
8.	Achievement of Performance Objectives Elementary Level 1	32
9.	Achievement of Performance Objectives Elementary Level 2	33
10.	Achievement of Performance Objectives Elementary Level 3	34
11.	Achievement of Performance Objectives Elementary Level 4	35
12.	Achievement of Performance Objectives Elementary Level 5	35
13.	Achievement of Performance Objectives Middle School Level 1	41
14.	Achievement of Performance Objectives Middle School Level 2	41
15.	Achievement of Performance Objectives Middle School Level 3	41
16.	Achievement of Performance Objectives Middle School Level 4	42
17.	Achievement of Performance Objectives Middle School Component	42

CHAPTER 1

DESCRIPTION OF THE PROGRAM

The Proposed Program.

In order to provide a clear picture of the design, nature, and scope of the program evaluation described in this report proposed program details have been presented in the following paragraphs. The evaluators assessed the program with regard to the extent to which the proposed design, nature, and scope were achieved.

Need for the Program.

The 1981-1982 E.S.E.A. Title I English as a Second Language Program in the Boston Public Schools was based on a three year (1980-1983) proposal submitted as an application for a grant to meet the special educational needs of educationally deprived children. As a federally funded program, it was to be conducted in accordance with both State and Federal regulations.

An assessment study of the educational needs of pupils in the Boston schools indicated a need for instruction in English as a Second Language in more than thirty schools. The E.S.L program focuses instruction on the attainment of those aural-oral and reading skills which are crucial to success in the regular English speaking classroom. Because of limitations imposed on the use of federal funds, only those schools which were deemed to be most in need of such instruction by the administrators and the supervisory staff of the Boston School Department's Department of Title I Programs were to be served during the 1981-1982 school year.

Although the program was originally designed to meet the needs of approximately one thousand pupils, the scope of the program for the 1981-1982 school year was reduced, and limited to some extent, because of imposed budgetary adjustments and considerations. In consonance with these adjustments, the program was implemented in grades one through five in twelve elementary schools, and in grades six through eight in three middle schools. One English as a Second Language teacher was assigned to each of the fifteen schools for the purpose of serving a proposed enrollment of forty-five pupils per school or a total enrollment of approximately seven hundred pupils.

The program's major objectives stressed the development of aural-oral English language skills of children with limited English speaking abilities, and the adjustment of these children both socially and academically. Emphasis on the preparation of these pupils for entrance into and success in the regular mainstream program of the school was also to be stressed.

Instructional Design

In order to provide individualized and small group instruction us-

ing an aural-oral approach, class size was planned to range from five to ten pupils per period. Each teacher was to be responsible for forty-six pupils in a total of six classes of from forty to sixty minutes duration per day. Classes were to meet five periods per week. Classroom settings were to be conducive to oral communication and to aural-oral linguistic methodologies and techniques.

Pupil Eligibility

Pupil eligibility on both the elementary and middle school levels was to be based on enrollment in bilingual classes and the satisfaction of Boston's standards for Title I participation (See page 3).

Program Administration

The Boston Public School's Department of Title I Programs administrative staff and the Title I Associate Director of Research and Evaluation were given the responsibility for the direction of the program. Immediate program coordination and supervision was to be provided by a program coordinator working in cooperation with both Title I administrators and the principals or building administrators in each of the cooperating schools.

The coordinator was to be responsible for the in-service training of program personnel, selection and distribution of appropriate instructional materials, articulation of E.S.L. instruction with bilingual education instruction, constructive liason between teachers and building administrators in the program schools, and the direction of instruction.

Each of the assigned program teachers was to be responsible for the keeping of records in accordance with the administrative practices of the Boston Public Schools, the requirements of the Title I Program, and the testing and recording of achievement as specified by the Title I Associate Director of Research and Evaluation.

The assigned community field coordinator was to be responsible for forming a liason between teachers, the Title I program as a whole, and non-English speaking parents. Responsibility was also to be placed on the field coordinator to act on teacher referrals related to attendance, health, and social and academic adjustment of program pupils.

Program Instruction

Pupil placement and program instruction was to be based on the diagnosed needs of pupils. Instruction was to be adjusted throughout the year in terms of on-going diagnosis and prescription in order to provide a smooth emotional, social, and academic transition to the English speaking community, and toward successful entrance and participation in English dominant classes.

Intensive English language instruction for improving listening comprehension, conversation and writing skills, as well as skills rela-

ted to reading was to be provided through the use of E.S.L. methodologies and techniques.

Complete records of pupil eligibility, attendance, and achievement were to be maintained at all times in individual pupil folders and were to be used in the planning of instruction. Pupil progress was to be measured on an on-going basis so that individualized and small group instruction might be planned in terms of constantly changing needs.

Self contained E.S.L. classes were to be divided into sub groups according to pupil's facility with English in order to provide each sub group with instruction in terms of its own needs. The pace of instruction was to be appropriate to the ages of the pupils and instructional materials were to be selected and used with reference to the interest and ability levels of pupils. Although oral communication skills were to be stressed, instruction in reading and writing was to be provided in accordance with each pupil's readiness level.

In order to provide E.S.L. instruction to pupils who needed it most, pupils on the elementary level were to be enrolled in classes according to three criteria. These included scores achieved on the Scale for Rating Pupil's Ability to Speak English (on the elementary level) or on the John Test of Oral Proficiency (on the middle school level), ratings on a specially designed Title I checklist, and consultation with a transitional bilingual education teacher.

Pupil Growth and Achievement - Elementary Level

The appraisal of pupil growth on the elementary level was to be based on the extent to which specially developed performance objectives for each specific E.S L. level had been mastered. It was expected that with no more than 11% absenteeism, pupils would achieve all of the objectives for their level and that they would also master a reasonable percentage of the objectives for the level above.

A comparison of pre-post scores achieved on the Scale for Rating Pupil's Ability to Speak English was to be used to measure the extent to which pupils in the program met the goal of increasing their scores by one level on the six level scale at the end of one year of program participation. Once again the determination of the extent of growth was to be based on scores achieved by those with no more than 11% absenteeism.

Pupil Growth and Achievement - Middle School Level

The appraisal of growth on the middle school level as on the elementary school level was to be based on the extent to which specially developed performance objectives for each specific E.S.L. level had been mastered. Mastery of all objectives on the pupil level and a reasonable percentage on the level above with no more than 11% absenteeism was expected.

A comparison of pre-post scores on the John Test was to be used to measure increased ability in the use of English. Anticipated growth

with no more than 11% absenteeism was a 10 point increase on the 100 point scale.

PROGRAM EVALUATION

Purpose of the Evaluation

The primary purpose of this evaluation is that of providing the Boston Public Schools with a broad description of the extent to which the actual implementation of the program, both from the standpoint of administration and instruction, achieved the specific program structure as outlined or implied in the previously outlined material drawn from the Title I Proposal for Funding.

Specifically the study was designed to offer both formative and summative assessment services and technical assistance with reference to the program's objectives, instructional activities, implementation, and administration.

Evaluation Objectives

1. To appraise the implementation of the program on both the elementary and middle school levels, and the procedures used to carry out the program's objectives (process) and
2. To assess the effectiveness of the program in bringing about desired changes in the pupils' command of the English language. (product).

Evaluation Procedures

In order to appraise the planning, administration, and implementation of the program during the year the following procedures were used.

1. Initial informal interviews were conducted with the Title I Associate Director of Research and Evaluation, the Program Coordinator, and selected members of the teaching staff.
2. All program in-service workshops were attended and assessed by members of the evaluation team. This included attendance at a pre-program orientation meeting and a meeting concerned with the provision of training in E.S.L. methods and techniques, and a final meeting concerned with data collection. Evaluators reported on assessment progress and participated in each of the meetings.

3. Initial and final interviews were conducted with all but one of the school administrators in charge of E.S.L. activities in the program schools. Structured interview guides were specifically designed at both the beginning and end of the program and used to objectify findings. Interviews were ongoing.

4. Initial and final structured interviews were conducted with all of the program teachers. Interviews were also ongoing throughout the assessment.

5. Each of the schools in the program was visited from three to five or more times for the purpose of gathering first hand information about instructional methods, techniques, facilities, materials, and supplies as well as administrative factors through direct observation. Specially constructed checklists were used in tabulating findings.

6. Pertinent notices, bulletins, and program information and communications were reviewed in terms of their possible effect on program implementation.

7. Enrollment data for both the first and second half year period were analyzed for the purpose of ascertaining pupil enrollment by grade levels and schools, information regarding pupil mobility, and determining teacher load.

8. Feedback was provided to the program coordinator and to the teaching and administrative staff through both individual conferences and oral reports at workshop meetings.

9. A questionnaire survey of all school administrators in charge of program schools and of all program teachers was conducted during the last month of program instruction. Specially designed questionnaires were used with each group.

10. Performance objective mastery on each level was analyzed and interpreted to determine the extent to which the program's goals in this area were achieved.

11. Test data gained through the administration of the New York Scale of Ability to Speak English, and the John Test of Oral English Proficiency, were analyzed, tabulated, and statistically treated where meaningful to determine the extent to which pupils achieved related program goals.

CHAPTER 2

PROCESS EVALUATION FINDINGS

Program Structure and Implementation

The assessment of the processes or procedures used in providing program instruction included the use of observation, interview, document review, and questionnaire techniques. This chapter presents a general description of the extent to which the actual program structure during the year conformed to the proposed program structure based on the use of these techniques. An analysis of attendance records was also used to gain information about enrollment, attendance, and pupil mobility. Specific information gained as a result of observations, interviews, and questionnaire administration follows the description of program structure.

The Staff and Program Schools

Observation findings throughout the year substantiated information gained at the beginning of the program at the initial orientation meeting of the administrative, teaching, and supportive staff, and during initial interviews with the Associate Director of Research and Evaluation and the Program Coordinator. Not only had a reduction in program staff been brought about by budgetary changes but changes in teacher assignments had caused a 75% turnover in the teaching staff. The program had been reduced from a staff of one coordinator, twenty-three teachers, twenty-three aides, and three community field coordinators during the 1980-81 school year, to one program coordinator, fifteen teachers, and one community field coordinator for the 1981-82 school year.

The large majority of the teachers in the program, as demonstrated by professional practice and knowledge as well as record and interview information were, in the opinion of the evaluators, highly skilled and although experienced, all but four had no previous experience as teachers of either English as a second language or of bilingual education. The reduction of the teaching staff, the inexperience of the newly assigned teachers in this area of instruction, and the loss of all paraprofessional aides as well as two of the community field coordinators appeared to present many problems. These problems were specifically related to implementing the program in terms of well established procedures, training new members of the staff in the basic approaches to the study of linguistics, the use of appropriate methods and techniques, specific and required record keeping procedures, and program logistics and implementation.

Schools selected to house the program were chosen on the basis of pupil needs in various geographic areas, the city's schedule of pupil distribution, and the previous existance of a program in a school and the resulting stability which this seemed to offer. Information gathered through the use of interviews with the Title I administrative and supervisory staff, program administrators and teachers in the program schools, and observations indicated that the 1981-82 program was successfully implemented in terms of the adjusted program plan in all twelve of the scheduled elementary and three middle schools. The program however was either delayed or interrupted in two of the schools because of teacher absence.

Pupil Selection and Preliminary Diagnostic Evaluation

This year, as in previous years, the program was to primarily serve children of limited English-speaking ability who were currently enrolled in the Bilingual Program of the Boston Public schools. Admission to the program was based on a priority list which was constructed using three criteria:

1. Score on the Title I English as a Second Language Scale for Rating Pupils' Ability to Speak English, or on the John Test
2. Number of points obtained on the specially designed Title I E.S.L. checklist
3. Consultation with the bilingual teacher as to the linguistic, social, and psychological needs of each child.

The program provided for the initial diagnostic testing and evaluation of E.S.L. pupils, both for pupils admitted at the beginning of the year and for new pupils entering during the year, by administration of the program's Title I E.S.L. Scale for Rating Pupils' Ability to Speak English, which gives a gross estimate of a pupil's English speaking ability in terms of grammatical structure, vocabulary, intonation, pronunciation and general fluency, and by administration of the appropriate level(s) of the program's behavioral performance objectives, which provides teachers with a very precise indication of the specific needs of pupils. The John Test of English Oral Proficiency which measures oral comprehension, ability in oral connected discourse, and ability to orally ask questions was used in place of the Scale as a pre and post test in the middle school program.

Interviews, observations, and examination of selected classroom records as well as mid-year and final reports gave clear indication that pupil selection and preliminary diagnostic evaluations had been implemented according to established program procedures. It was noted however that in five of the program schools initial testing was implemented later than it might have been.

Pupil Enrollment

The program at the end of December had a total reported enrollment of 599 pupils on the elementary level, and 114 pupils in the middle schools, or a program total of 713. At the end of the year the reported enrollment was 583 on the elementary level and 128 on the middle school level resulting in a program total of 711. Only 32 pupil discharges were reported on the elementary level during the September through December period, indicating that the total enrollment (or number of pupils actually served) during the period had been 631. The discharge rate on this level for the period was .05. During the second half of the year teachers on the elementary level level reported 41 discharges. The total number of discharges for the year on the elementary level was 73. This number, added to the

583 active pupils reported indicates that the program served 656 pupils on the level and that the discharge rate for the level for the year was .11. Second-half year middle-school enrollment was 131. 131. The discharge of 3 pupils brought final enrollment to 128. On this level a total of 150 pupils had been served during the year, and 22 had been discharged resulting in a discharge rate of .15.

On a program wide basis the program consistently served between 710 and 715 pupils and met its' enrollment expectations. In all, the program served 806 pupils at one time or another during the year. A program dropout rate or discharge rate of .12 did not appear to be excessively high for this type of pupil population and pupil mobility did not appear to present an organizational or instructional problem. Pupil enrollment during the first and second half of the year is presented in Tables 1 and 2.

The average enrollment of 712 pupils indicates a teacher load of 47.5 pupils.

TABLE 1

Pupil Enrollment by Grade

September through December, 1981

	Elementary Schools													Middle Schools				
Grade	Agassiz	Blackstone	Condon	Hennigan	Hernandez	Holland	Hurley	Kennedy	Kent	Mattahunt	Murphy	Tobin	Total (Elem.)	Dearborn	Edison	Taft	Total (Middle)	Total (Program)
1	16	28	10	10	21	18	8	27	13	12	12	21	196					196
2	4	11	6	18	12	14	16	13	5	19	7	14	139					139
3	9	3	13	0	11	13	12	5	10	10	7	11	104					104
4	6	4	8	14	2	7	10	1	13	4	20	10	99					99
5	10	4	9	9	3	3	2	5	6	5	9	1	66					66
6														18	11	18	47	47
7														13	12	4	29	29
8														8	19	11	38	38
Dec. Total	45	50	46	51	49	55	48	51	47	50	55	57	599	39	42	33	114	713
Disch.	1	2	2	4	0	7	0	7	1	0	2	6	32		19		19	51
Prog. Total	46	52	48	55	49	62	48	58	48	50	57	63	631	39	61	33	133	764

TABLE 2

Pupil Enrollment by Grade

January through May, 1982

	Elementary Schools													Middle Schools				
Grade	Agassiz	Blackstone	Condon	Hennigan	Hernandez	Holland	Hurley	Kennedy	Kent	Mattahunt	Murphy	Tobin	Total (Elem.)	Dearborn	Edison	Taft	Total (Middle)	Total (Program)
1	16	25	9	10	20	15	8	25	13	5	12	17	175					175
2	7	11	7	19	21	9	22	13	5	22	6	8	150					150
3	9	3	10	1	9	12	13	6	10	6	6	11	96					96
4	6	3	11	13	2	7	10	1	13	4	17	7	94					94
5	10	4	13	8	3	5	2	3	8	4	7	1	68					68
6														19	11	23	53	53
7														15	13	6	34	34
8														11	20	10	41	41
May Total	48	46	50	51	55	48	55	48	49	41	48	44	583	45	44	39	128	711
Disch.	8	4	2	0	5	3	2	0	0	6	4	7	41	0	3	0	3	44
Prog. Total	56	50	52	51	60	51	57	48	49	47	52	51	624	45	47	39	131	755

Pupil Attendance

Analysis of attendance data submitted by the program teachers indicated a generally stable population of 531 pupils on the elementary level and 116 on the middle school level. Enrollment figures reported above show a slightly higher population than those used in the computation of attendance percentages for the program. The sporadic pre-discharge attendance of those who left the program, and the limited attendance of many who entered the program late made it inadvisable to include these pupils in the overall determination of attendance rates for the components and the program as a whole.

The number of days the program operated in each of the schools according to teacher reports varied. In one school, because a beginning of the year substitute teacher had not passed on records of attendance, attendance for only 83 days was reported. One teacher reported the program to have been conductedas many as 134 days while another reported 140 days of operation. Because these data as reported did not appear to correspond to calendar days of school operation the evaluators took the liberty of using the data submitted in conjunction with the program schedule and school calendar to adjust the number of class days conducted in some instances. Evaluator analysis of days of actual program operation in seven reports was lower than the 121 days of instruction anticipated. Although this figure was used in computing the possible pupil days of attendance its use may in some cases lowered the percentage of attendance achieved by a school to some extent.

The following tabulation (Table 3) shows the precentages of attendance for each of the components and for the program as a whole. Percentages were arrived at by dividing the number of days pupils were present for program instruction (pupil days present) by the total number of days that they would have attended (possible pupil days) if they had been present for all class sessions.

TABLE 3

PUPIL ATTENDANCE

School	No. of Class Days	Enrollment (Stable)	Pupil Days Present	Possible Pupil Days	Percent
Agassiz	83	34	1715	2822	61
Blackstone	122	48	5035	5856	86
Condon	124	50	5661	6200	91
Hennigan	129	48	4730	6192	76
Hernandez	121	43	3609	5203	69
Holland	121	47	4002	5687	70
Hurley	134	46	5096	6164	83
Kennedy	121	40	4287	4840	89
Kent	121	46	4970	5566	89
Mattahunt	121	39	3559	4719	75
Murphy	121	43	3723	5203	72
Tobin	127	47	5148	5969	86
Elem. Totals		531	51535	64421	80
Dearborn	121	42	4956	5082	98
Edison	121	35	3512	4235	83
Taft	121	39	4568	4719	97
Middle Sch. Totals		116	13036	14036	93
Program Totals		647	64571	78457	82

Analysis and interpretation of attendance reports indicate that the major program population was stable and varied little from the overall enrollment figures presented earlier. The total difference between program enrollment at the end of the year (711) and the population that the evaluators considered to be stable (647) and therefore used in the computations was 64. The highest attendance rating was achieved on the elementary level by the Condon School with 91% and on the middle school level by the Dearborn School with 98% according to reported data. The program as a whole achieved and attendance rating for the year of 82%.

OBSERVATION FINDINGS

As mentioned earlier in this report, each of the program schools was visited from three to five times during the school year. Observations in these schools were of sufficient length for adequate judgements to be made regarding the use of instructional methods, techniques, teaching aids and materials, the planning of instruction, the grouping of children, the assessment of growth, and the keeping of records. In order to objectify the assessment of teaching procedures, materials, the appearance of rooms, and group size and arrangements special checklists developed by the evaluators were used.

Instructional Methods

Methods of teaching varied from school to school ranging from a strictly formal approach to highly individualized activity. The fact that program teachers did not have the assistance of an aide during the current year however seemed to limit the amount of small group and individualized work. The structured objectives designed for each of the several levels appeared to dictate the content to be covered and to unify the approach to some extent throughout the program. In addition, the program structure and materials seemed to contribute to the adjustment of teachers new to the program with reference to both the content and approach to be used. In spite of the fact that a uniformity appeared to exist throughout the program there were wide variations in methodology and techniques used in classrooms at different times during the year. Although the teaching staff was predominantly new to the program, methodology observed was basically appropriate to the levels of the groups being taught and to the content of the performance objectives. Methods and techniques used often appeared to reflect and depend on the performance objectives to be covered and to reflect the diagnosed needs of the pupils being taught. Instructional materials prepared and distributed through the program offices seemed to almost dictate the method to be used with much of the subject content. The techniques used included game playing, role playing, story telling, discussion, dictation, and construction activities. As in past programs teaching content included the matching of objects and words, the development of word patterns, the naming of pictures or parts of pictures, color identification, naming parts of the body, days of the week, months of the year, size and time relationships, size and shape discrimination, eye and hand coordination, the development of writing skills, the concept of main ideas, following directions, the development of conversational skills, and basic skills in reading.

Game and role playing was used as an approach in which children acted out past, present, and future, or time, or any content which might be taught to advantage through the use of this technique. A construction technique was used in some classes to teach the names of parts of things being constructed or discussed, past and present tense, colors, possessive case, and conversational skills.

Evaluators noted that although the formal planning of instruction did not seem to be a program strength, teachers appeared to be well organized, to systematically follow a lesson aim or objective, and to give clear and sequential directions. As experienced teachers, the large majority, although apparently confused early in the year by their assignment to a new instructional area, followed appropriate aural-oral procedures, asked for clear speech and complete sentences, and used a variety of techniques calling for listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Several followed with in-class and home-study assignments. The majority of teachers were found to be outgoing, warm, and attentive to individual needs.

In summary, instruction was predominantly provided to entire class groups with individualized activity and instruction being provided after the group instruction. As prescribed, an aural-oral approach was being used in almost all classes observed. Methodology varied with the developmental or question-answer techniques in conjunction with other techniques such as role playing, games, constructions, and specially prepared sheets being predominant. A variety of techniques were used to advantage in motivating and maintaining interest. On a few occasions however, instruction was found to be teacher dominated and to lack inspiration and vitality.

Although the teaching staff was experienced it was obvious in several instances, because of an apparent need for training in E.S.L. methods and techniques, that there was a need for training in contrastive and transitional linguistics, and in the psychology of second language acquisition.

The program appears to have remained strong because of the clear-cut instructional goals that have been established, the "level" structured performance objectives, the job sheets and unit guides that have been specially prepared by the coordinator with the aid of members of the teaching staff, and the continued efforts of the program coordinator.

In spite of the lack of staff experience and training in E.S.L. methods and techniques the teaching backgrounds of the majority of teachers seem to have enabled most to provide instruction in logical sequence and with attention to the psychology of learning.

Teaching Materials and Aids

New to the program, many teachers used materials or aids which they had used in other teaching situations or which they had prepared as the year progressed. Because many of the materials available to them in the schools were new to them, teachers did not always seem to use them to the greatest advantage or where or when they might have been used. As a result of this program being in operation during the past fifteen years, an abundance of carefully selected teaching materials was available in each of the program schools where program materials had accumulated from previous years and had remained. Because the program has administered to a predominantly Hispanic elementary school population in the past, the majority of the materials are most appropriate to this group. It has been the opinion of the evaluators however, that many of these materials can be adapted for use at least in part, in teaching children of other linguistic backgrounds. Schools that seemed to be in need of materials were those

in which children of other than Hispanic backgrounds such as Chinese, Korean, Cape Verdean, and Haitian were being taught. There also appeared to be a need for materials more fitting for older children on the middle school level. It should also be pointed out that in addition to having an abundance of materials and aids available to them, teachers in the program had received and allowance of funds to purchase additional materials of their own selection and that the program coordinator had provided additional materials to several of the schools.

In summary, the program has an abundance of teaching materials for use with children of Hispanic backgrounds but appears to be in need of materials for use with other linguistic groups and with older pupils such as those on the middle school levels. Many teachers had not become fully acquainted with the available materials during the year and had not used them to advantage, in the opinion of the evaluators. It should also be noted that several teachers had personally prepared or supplied many of the aids and materials they were using.

The Planning of Instruction - Lesson Plans

The established organization of content and course structure prepared for the program as a whole by the central Title I Office, with input from the program teaching staff over a fifteen year period has, in the opinion of the evaluators, made it possible for the program to achieve its goals in spite of program uncertainty and academically unwise changes in personnel.

Although classroom organization and structure throughout the year reflected the fact that instruction was based on the diagnosed needs of pupils, on-going assessment of pupil growth, and the use of specially developed performance objectives on each of the instructional levels, there did not appear to be a careful and thorough approach to the planning of daily instruction on the part of most of the teachers. Plans examined or reviewed throughout the assessment had, in the majority, been developed as weekly plans or guides rather than actual plans for specific lessons. Individualized planning was almost non existant. Plans that had been developed appeared to lack uniformity which, although not always desirable, may have been somewhat helpful in this program particularly with so many of the teachers being newly assigned.

In summary, a strong program structure appeared to make it possible for the instructional procedures used to be effective although individual teacher lesson planning seemed to be weak and to need direction.

Grouping of Children

Small class size, ranging from six to nine pupils in most classes observed, seemed to be conducive to the provision of instruction to entire classes rather than to groups within classes. After basic content had been taught and individual assignments had been made an

individualized approach was used in many of the rooms. There was little evidence of grouping within entire class groups on a program-wide basis.

The Assessment of Growth

In addition to the regular testing program for the collection of both placement and achievement data program teachers assessed pupil progress on a daily basis in many of the classes. Ongoing testing of individual mastery of performance objectives was conducted for the purpose of diagnosing pupil needs and planning instruction in terms of these needs. There appeared to be a tendency on the part of those new to the program however to note individual progress less frequently than those who had previous program experience and to pace instruction on the basis of class rather than individual progress. Records of achievement of performance objectives examined by the evaluators throughout the year did show systematic gains and, in many cases, the coverage of two levels of performance objectives by individual pupils.

The Keeping of Records

Systematic procedures developed by the Title I Office of Research and Evaluation routinized the on-going recording of enrollment, attendance, and achievement data for each pupil and the reporting of these data at mid-year and late in May. Although instruction in the use of specially prepared and relatively simple data sheets was provided at the beginning of the year teachers in many instances appeared to be overwhelmed by the need to keep these records on a daily basis. Problems of "excessive paper work" appeared to result from the fact that many teachers had not developed a daily routine of record keeping. A majority of the teachers maintained their own records in their own way however some allowed official record keeping chores to accumulate. Record keeping skills including neatness and legibility also seemed to be a problem for several teachers. Records maintained by the teachers for their own use often lacked uniformity and system.

In keeping with practices of the Title I E.S.L. program individual progress folders were kept for each pupil in each class. Personal folders of pupils contained drawings, worksheets, and reproduced exercise sheets which had been or were being completed and which reflected the extent of individual pupil daily achievement and progress. The motivational and instructional use of these folders by teachers who had been in the program before this year appeared to be efficient and effective. Many teachers new to the program did not seem to use them to their fullest advantage. Confidential folders for each child contain-program eligibility, placement and test data, and parent consent forms. In a majority of rooms these records were carefully kept and systematically filed.

In summary, systematic procedures developed by the Title I Office routinized the keeping of program enrollment, attendance, and achievement data in the schools. On a classroom basis individual progress and con fidential folders were maintained for each pupil. Analysis of observation findings indicate a need on the part of many teachers, particularly those unacquainted with program record keeping procedures, for concentrated in-service training in this area.

INTERVIEW FINDINGS

Specially prepared interview guides for use with administrators and with teachers were prepared early in the program and again in May. The purpose of gathering information through the use of the interview technique was that of gaining insight into the opinions and views of the program staff regarding its implementation, effectiveness, strengths, and weaknesses. Initial interviews were conducted with all but one of the fifteen school administrators and one of the fifteen program teachers. Final interviews were conducted with all but one of the administrators and all of the program teachers.

Interviews with Administrators

Initial interviews with administrators indicated a belief that the program had started on time in most schools with a few delays being caused by teacher illness and teacher reassignment. Most regarded their roles with the program as being supervisory and supportive. Differences between this year's program and the previous year's were regarded as results of the shifting of teachers which was out of their control and control of the Title I Office. Teacher strengths were noted as being experience, qualifications, and teaching personality. Responses dealing with teacher weaknesses bearing on the performance of E.S.L. responsibilities were non existant. Program strengths were said to be central office support, small group and individualized instruction leading to pupil adjustment, and program structure. Weaknesses were viewed to be the limited time devoted to the study of English and the paper work required of teachers. Almost all were supportive of the program and seven expressed a desire to expand it in their schools. A large majority said that the program coordinator had been helpful and had, at that time, made visits on a monthly basis. Parent activities and participation according to most were extremely limited and in some instances were non existant. Recommendations for program improvement at mid year were concerned with the provision of more time for instruction in English, aides for program teachers, and improved instructional and test materials.

Final interview responses of administrators in the schools supported early interview findings and observation findings throughout the year. Responses to final interwiew questions are presented in the following paragraphs.

When asked whether they believed that the objectives of the Title I E.S.L. program had been achieved in their schools ten said "yes". Teacher illness, the assignment of a new teacher, the need for materials, and teacher inefficiency were reasons expressed for reservations on the part of the other four administrators interviewed.

In response to a question about the strengths of the staff eight said that the teachers were excellent, outstanding, or strong, three that teachers had "come a long way" but needed more training, two that they had good rapport with pupils, and one that they had good teaching skills. Ten administrators also expressed satisfaction with the work of the community field coordinator who they said was excellent (5),

helpful (3), or good (2). In commenting on the strengths of the program coordinator ten said that she had given excellent, great, or fine service however five of these specified a need for greater availability during the year. Four others said that they believed she was good (1), very helpful (1), or well trained (2).

Several program strengths were noted by the administrators. Among these were the structure of the program (5), the tie-in with bilingual education (5), an abundance and variety of materials (4), opportunity for teacher growth (3), creative teaching (2), the teaching staff (2), motivational value (2), small group instruction (2), mainstreaming (2). Weaknesses were viewed as being related to the insecurity of the program (4), the need for additional teachers (4), the lack of continuity of teacher assignments (2), and the need for additional training of teachers (2).

According to eight of the fourteen administrators interviewed the program served all of the program eligible pupils in their schools while six said that they needed additional teachers. The opinion was expressed by some (4) that all pupils in need of instruction cannot be served because of the guide line ratios imposed.

In answer to a question about the extent to which the program helped in the adjustment of E.S.L. pupils to the entire school program six said that it had helped considerably, six that it had made communication in the school and community possible, five that the small class size was comfortable or reduced fear of error, four that it contributed to the development of better self image, and three that the program had been motivational. Improved integration (1) and improved attendance (1) were also mentioned as being helpful in the adjustment of program pupils.

In discussing the most effective procedures to employ in serving E.S.L. pupils six considered the use of structured skill sheets and good material to be most useful while three praised small group and individualized instruction, and one suggested creative teaching. Six expressed the opinion that the program should continue the procedures being used and that the program should be maintained.

With the possible reduction of the program during the coming year administrators were asked how they planned to service pupils in need of E.S.L. instruction. Ten said that they intended to follow the same procedures. Two said that they intended to use bilingual teachers who would have to assume responsibility for E.S.L. if the program was dropped. The need for additional motivational approaches such as music, dramatics, and writing was stressed by two and the need for closer relationships between E.S.L. and bilingual teachers by another. In answer to the question one administrator again referred to the unstable nature of the program and said "time will tell".

The principal accomplishments of the program according to school administrators were the development of communication and English language skills (12), and the adjustment of pupils to their surroundings both in and out of school (10). The mainstreaming of pupils (3), excellent test results (3), the growth of confidence and motivation of those pupils with few English speaking skills (2), improved attendance (2), and teacher growth were also noted as principal program accomplishments.

When asked what recommendations, if any, they would make to improve the program almost all were positive. Answers included "None" (3), "Keep the present teacher and set up". (3), "Let it be. Its a good program." (2), "Carry on." (2), and "Expand the program." (3). More specific recommendations made by individual school administrators suggested a closer relationship with the bilingual program, a pilot program using bilingual and regular classroom teachers and employing E.S.L. methods, the transfer of bilingual education to E.S.L. for better results, and a "better tie in" with general curriculum goals. Recommendations dealing with instructional procedures included increased in-service education, the use of team teaching approaches, increased use of tapes and audio equipment. In speaking of teacher efficiency it was suggested that Title I financed aides be assigned to assist with paper work and that, if the program is to loose the coordinator as a result of proposed budget cut backs, in-service training be provided by a regular (reading) Title I coordinator. It was also suggested that a "floating" person be assigned to help in the adjustment of pupils. All of the administrators at one time during interviews stressed the need to eliminate program uncertainty and to make the program more stable.

In summary, early interviews with administrators indicated that the program as a whole had begun on time but that changes in the program staff had been somewhat disruptive. The teaching staff was regarded by the majority as being experienced and well qualified. Central office support and small group and individualized instruction were considered to be the program's strengths. Many however, expressed the opinion that there should be more time allotted to the study of English. According to most, parental involvement in the program was almost nonexistant. Almost all were completely supportive of the program and some recommended program expansion. Quantified answers to interview questions were provided in the evaluator's interim report.

Final interview responses indicated a belief that program objectives had been achieved and that school administrators were satisfied with the work of the program coordinator, the teaching staff, and the community field coordinator. The program's structure, tie in with bilingual education, and an abundance of materials were regarded as program strong points while program insecurity and the need for additional teachers were regarded as major weaknesses. In most schools according to administrators, all eligible pupils were served. Some said however that the need for an additional teacher and guide line ratios made it impossible to serve all who needed program help. All expressed the opinion that the program had achieved one of its goals by contributing to the adjustment of pupils. The principal accomplishments of the program were considered to be the adjustment of pupils, the development of communication skills, and the rate of pupil achievement. All administrators, at one time during the interviews, praised the program's well established structure and recommended the elimination of program uncertainty and the program's continuation.

Interviews with Teachers

Beginning of the year interviews with fourteen of the fifteen program teachers disclosed the fact that all were experienced and that the average number of years of teaching was 13.2. Of the fourteen however, only five had experience in either E.S.L. or bilingual education.

Answers also revealed that only three had taken courses in linguistics or bilingual education and that only five had some second language background. Only seven of the fourteen had some travel or work experience which might have contributed to their effectiveness in teaching E.S.L. classes.

Eleven teachers reported a smooth beginning of the year start. Others reported delays caused by a "mix-up" in the assignment of teachers, the need to learn a new program structure, limited materials, and difficulties in getting pupils released from regular classes. Teachers stated that they believed that the program's broad objectives were concerned with helping pupils to adjust to their new environment, and to provide a basis for mainstreaming. Six also considered helping pupils to gain fluency in English to be one of the objectives. All said that they believed that these objectives were being carried out.

According to the large majority adequate supplies, teaching materials, and books were available for their use and that these materials had been delivered by the program coordinator or provided by the Title I Office. All but two said that supplies or materials had been delivered on time. Picture charts (teacher and commercially made) and the "Yes" Series were considered to be the most useful by many although fifteen different aids and materials were put in this catagory by those interviewed. One expressed the opinion that aids were inadequate on the middle school level while others said that they could not judge at that time because they were new to the program.

Responses to questions concerned with teaching content and methodology indicated that the large majority were using the program's performance objectives and job sheets as guides for content and in checking on the skills accomplished. At least half expressed a need for more time to learn about the program. At mid year there were few suggestions related to the improvement of in-service training although many expressed a need for additional program information.

According to most, the program's major accomplishments at that time were related to the adjustment and achievement of pupils and the development of respect for other cultures. Weaknesses were noted as being related to insufficient time for the study of English, lack of parental involvement, excessive paper work, and the need for aides. Several who commented on how the program as a whole might be improved suggested increased and structured pupil time in English both in and out of school. Mid-year interview responses were quantified in the evaluator's interim report.

Final interviews were conducted with fourteen of the fifteen program teachers. Nine said that they had served throughout the year, three that they had started late, and one that a shift in personnel had been made during the year.

Inanswer to a question concerned with administrative or supply problems during the year most (11) reported "None". One teacher did report a need for supplies, one for improved communications regarding supplies, and another suggested a need for more record forms and instruction on the use of these forms at the beginning of the year.

When asked in what ways they believed the broad objectives of the pro-

gram had been achieved five said that they believed the basic structure, objectives, and materials had helped in the development of communication skills (5) and in the use of the aural-oral approach (5). Creative planning, ideas, amd methods according to some (4) also contributed to the achievement of goals. The motivational aspects of instruction and the adjustment of pupils were also credited (3) for making the achievement of goals possible. The support of other teachers (1) and workshop activities (1) were also mentioned as being of value.

In speaking of special linguistic or cultural activities they were able to conduct during the year several (7) said that they had taught about the holidays of different cultures and had compared them. Others reported a multi-cultural fair (1), a field trip to a nursing home (1), a theatre arts group (1), and a play (1). When asked about the extent and results of these activities the beliefs were expressed that they had brought about a better understanding of people (3), information about other cultures (2), a greater acceptance of others (2), a warm feeling toward school through motivation and enjoyment (3), had led to better integration (1), and to mainstreaming of pupils (1). Two teachers reported that they had conducted few or no special activities.

The extent to which parental participation could be stimulated was considered to be "Very little" (6) or "None" (2), or "Practically none" by more than half of the teachers. Those who reported some participation said that they believed that it had created better ties or a "warm feeling" between parents and the school (2).

When asked for suggestions they would make to teachers entering the program a majority (13) suggested that the E.S.L. materials be studied and learned early in the year. It was also said (2) that it should be realized that progress is slow. Others (2) advised that structured procedures be closely and consistently followed, that there be a test for each skill (1), and that new teachers "over plan" for every period (1). Four said that they would counsel others not to be overwhelmed by the paper work.

In answer to a question about improving instruction through in-service training several teachers suggested more workshops. Five were of the opinion that each teacher should present and share ideas while others (2) suggested workshop developed tests in all skills, special workshops on methods (3), and the development of tests and pupil activities in terms of age levels (1).

According to most, the program objectives were clear and provided good training for teachers as well as pupils. Some said that it had been a good year, a great challenge, or a rewarding experience and that they were eager to return.

The most frequent suggestion for program improvement had to do with the need for additional preparation for the job, how to use the program units in the development of skills, and the development of plans or a plan book. It was suggested that program materials be made available for study by new teachers at the beginning of the year and that more help be provided in the use of communication skills. Suggestions related to pupil selection ranged from the need to improve placement tests to the elimination of a "dumping ground" approach through careful selection. More input from E.S.L. teachers on entrance, placement, and mainstreaming of pupils was said to be needed.

Several teachers expressed the opinion that pupils should have more exposure to English. A few believed that instruction in English should be increased for older pupils and that there should be more written work required. Instruction in the child's native language, according to one, should be limited to a single period per day.

The principal accomplishments of the program according to a majority were the adjustment of pupils (10), and gains in pupil ability to communicate (10). The mainstreaming of pupils was also considered to be a major accomplishment (3). It was remarked by several that pupils had been comfortable, enjoyed coming to school, and can "survive as a result of program instruction. Test results were also praised by a few.

Program weaknesses were considered to be uncertainty, instability, and the changing of teachers each year (9), the need for additional teachers (4), and excessive paper work (3).

In closing, evaluators asked for suggestions for program improvement. Responses varied with each teacher making one or more recommendations. Most were concerned with increasing E.S.L. teacher input in the selection and placement process, the training of teachers new to the program, and intensifying instruction in English. Some expressed a belief that closer ties should be established between E.S.L. and bilingual teachers while others suggested increasing the number of E.S.L. teachers, the provision of more supervision for teachers of bilingual education, and the replacement of bilingual education with a strong E.S.L. program.

In summary, early interviews with teachers indicated that an early and relatively smooth start had been made in most schools by an experienced staff of teachers who were predominantly new to E.S.L. and who had little or no training for it. In spite of this, they appeared to understand the general objectives and thrust of the program and to adjust to program routines and materials with the aid of the well established program structure.

Final interview responses indicated that the program had basically remained stable through the year although some problems had been brought about by teacher assignment shifts and teacher illness. Teachers on the whole appeared to believe that the major objectives had been accomplished and that the structure, objectives, materials, and motivational aspects of the program had made this possible. Answers indicated that few or no special or extra program cultural activities had been conducted to stimulate pupil or parental interest and that parental participation had been minimal. (Only a few of the "special activities" mentioned by teachers were not those which would be engaged in as regular program instruction.)

Those interviewed suggested that teachers new to the program either take, or be given, time to study readily available program materials at the beginning of the year, learn the materials, and strictly follow the program structure. Special training in planning, methods, and testing, and the sharing of ideas through workshops was suggested as a means of improving teacher skills.

Concern was expressed about procedures used in the selection and placement of pupils and the need for more E.S.L. teacher input in the process. It was also believed that instruction in English should be intensified.

The principal accomplishments of the program were said to be the adjustment of pupils and the development of communication skills however the program's uncertainty and instability were considered to be negative factors.

Recommendations for improving the overall program restated earlier suggestions regarding careful pupil selection, the training of new teachers, and intensifying instruction in English. Closer ties with bilingual education and increasing and strengthening the E.S.L. program also appeared to be major concerns of program teachers.

QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

Responses of Administrators

Completed questionnaires were returned by ten of the fifteen school administrators in charge of schools having Title I E.S.L. programs.

Responses indicated that only three respondents thought that pupil mobility had negatively affected their programs during the year and none indicated that community problems or tension had negative affects. Only one administrator however reported good parent attendance at an E.S.L. event while seven reported "some" parents had attended. Two said that parents did not attend at all.

According to the ten respondants teacher attendance or lateness had not been a negative factor in the conduct of their programs and all but one said that they were "greatly" satisfied with instruction in E.S.L. classes. Similarly all but three expressed great satisfaction with the service provided by the central Title I office while one indicated not being satisfied at all.

When responding to a question concerning the extent to which the program met the needs of the schools six said that it had "to some extent", three that it had fully met their needs, and one that it had not. All however said that the program had met the needs of the non-English speaking children it had served.

All ten administrators expressed a belief that the major or broad objectives of the program had been achieved and that the program should be continued in the schools. Nine recommended the expansion of the program.

Suggestions offered for program improvement were related to the provision of E.S.L. teachers in terms of the number of pupils needing instruction (3), maintaining program stability through the retention of assigned program teachers (2), and the provision of additional materials.

In summary, responses of school administrators indicated a relatively undisturbed instructional program for the year. Neither pupil mobility nor community tensions had been disruptive factors although parent involvement was apparently low. General satisfaction regarding teacher performance and attendance, as well as for the program services provided by the Title I office, was indicated. Although responses pointed out the fact that the program had not, because of its limited size, served all of the schools as well as it might have it had fully met the needs of the children it did serve, and its broad objectives.

All ten respondants recommended continuation of the program and nine recommended its expansion. To improve the program it was suggested that teachers be assigned in relation to a school's needs, that the same teachers be maintained from year to year, and that additional materials be provided.

Responses of Teachers

According to the responses of thirteen of the fifteen teachers, all but three served in the program for the entire year. The same three reported that their program's had not started promptly in September. One teacher indicated that her program had not run smoothly during a part of the year because of personal absence resulting from an accident. All but two indicated that enrollment had remained constant for the year and that their enrollments had ranged within the prescribed numbers. No teacher indicated that enrollment had fallen below 35 at any time during the nine month period. Pupil mobility was said to have had negative affects on the program of one teacher and four reported that attendance had not always remained at 85% or better. One teacher, in reporting a need for enrichment materials, indicated that teaching supplies and materials had not been satisfactory. In answer to a question about in-service assistance all but one teacher said that they had received sufficient help during the year. Additional assistance suggested by the teachers included the provision of sample lesson plans, more orientation on record keeping, and a workshop on lesson planning. It was also suggested that more help be given to those new to the program.

Responses to questions concerned with procedures used in measuring pupil needs and achievement revealed the dissatisfaction of three of the respondents who suggested a need for improved clarity of the New York Scale test pictures (1), a need for the use of the Lau Testing Program inEnglish (1), and the need to give English priority rather than elective status.

Without exception respondents expressed the view that the program had achieved its broad objectives. Major program strengths were considered to be the program objectives and the relaxed atmosphere the program affords. Weaknesses were noted to be the turnover or reassignment of teachers, the need for additional teachers, and the attitude of bilingual teachers toward E.S.L. Specific comments of teachers indicated a belief that "E.S.L. teacher turnover is unfair to both pupils and teachers." and that "E.S.L. should be devoted entirely to teaching English to non-English speakers." One teacher commented "The students knew little or nothing of American history, culture, heros, holidays . . . I believe these should be motivation for a desire to learn the English language and the culture of the land they live in."

In summary, responses of teachers indicated that only four had not served in the program for the entire year. Enrollment and attendance were reported to be stable, with only one reporting attendance being below 85% at any time during the year. Supplies and materials were found to be satisfactory by most. One respondent indicated that in-service assistance had not been satisfactory. Suggestions made to improve this included help in lesson planning, record keeping, and program implementation. Improvement in procedures for measuring pupil needs and achievement was also suggested.

Teachers believed, according to responses, that the program's broad objectives had been achieved and that the program's basic objectives and the atmosphere it encouraged were its major strengths. Its weaknesses according to respondents were related to teacher turnover, program size, and the negative attitudes of some non-ESL teachers.

A few teachers added personal comments regarding the importance of the role of English as a Second Language.

In-Service Training

The in-service training of the newly assigned staff began with an in-service workshop held early in September prior to the opening of school. The agenda for that meeting, attended by the Associate Director of Research and Evaluation, thirteen of the fifteen program teachers, the community field coordinator, the 1980-81 program evaluator, and conducted by the program coordinator, included general orientation to the teaching of E.S.L., aspects of the program that would be evaluated during the year, methods of teacher evaluation of pupil performance on both the elementary and middle school levels, and record keeping and reporting procedures.
Two subsequent meetings were held during the first three months of program instruction for the purpose of providing training related to subject content, pupil achievement, and transitional E.S.L. methods and techniques.
A fourth meeting was held early in the second half of the year. As in previous meetings, emphasis was placed on methodology through a presentation on the philosophy of bilingual education, a training session on the use of the New Horizons in English Series, an explanation of a model instructional unit and the Cambridge Work-a-Text Series by members of the staff, and an analysis and a review of procedures and considerations in introducing reading to beginning E.S.L. pupils. Project evaluation findings were also briefly reviewed.
At a fifth and final workshop, detailed instruction on the recording and reporting of enrollment, attendance, and achievement data was provided by the Title I Associate Director of Research and Evaluation. Although a majority of the workshop time was devoted to the completion of data forms a portion of the time was used to review various aspects of the program as seen during visits by the evaluator.

New members of the teaching staff interviewed immediately after in-service meeting sessions said that the meeting content had been helpful to them and that much of what had been covered would be used in their teaching. Staff members who had been in the program before explained that they were familiar with the material covered and that they would like to cover material that would be new to them. Members of the middle school staff expressed a need for in-service time to develop specific job sheets, tests, and unit materials for their level.

Interview and observation findings revealed that additional and concentrated in-service training had been provided on an individual basis by the program coordinator who had made an average of four, or monthly, visits to each of the program schools for the purpose of assisting, training, and providing appropriate and needed materials. These visits have, according to both school administrators and program teachers, been helpful and effective.

CHAPTER 3

PRODUCT EVALUATION FINDINGS

Appraisal of Growth

The appraisal of pupil growth and program success was accomplished by comparing pre-post measurement scores obtained in instruments used initially to diagnose pupil needs and by determining the extent to which specially designated performance objectives on each program level were achieved. An analysis of these data is presented in this chapter.

THE NEW YORK RATING SCALE - ELEMENTARY COMPONENT

The Scale, as a measure of growth, was used in the program's elementary component to measure the extent to which the program met its goal of one level of achievement on the Scale at the end of one year of program participation. Specifically the objective to be measured was:

> Given approximately forty-five minutes of instruction five days per week for the school year, with no more than 11% absenteeism, each student will increase his rating by one level as measured by the New York Scale for Rating Pupil's Ability to Speak English.

The Scale, which was teacher administered, consists of a detailed checklist covering five areas of linguistic competence. These include 1) Structural Patterns, 2) Vocabulary, 3) Intonation, 4) Pronunciation, and 5) Oral Fluency. Teacher's ratings for each child in these five areas on a scale of 1-6 were used in pre-post testing. The gross representation of each level is expressed as follows:

1. Speaks no English,
2. Speaks English only in stereotyped situations for which he has learned a few words and phrases,
3. Speaks English haltingly but can handle more than a few of the routine situations noted above,
4. Speaks English well enough for most situations but with conscious effort to avoid second-language interference and with hesitancy at times,
5. Speaks English with a foreign accent but otherwise approaches native fluency for a child of his age,
6. Speaks English like a native of his age.

Results of ratings by ESL teachers at the beginning of the year were analyzed in detail by the evaluators. In addition to providing a baseline from which to measure pupil progress the analysis of the pre-ratings also served diagnostic purposes. Data submitted at that time indicated that a total of 617 pupils from all elementary component classes were rated on most parts of the Scale. At the end of the year the number of pupils having both pre and post scors for all parts of the Scale, or for whom total pre and post scores could be matched was 555.

With few exceptions end of year scores in each of the Scale areas differed with beginning of the year scores by only one or two scale points indicating relatively even overall growth in each area. The range of scores on each instructional level was generally within a fifteen scale point range rather than twenty as it was in some previous years indicating somewhat greater homogenieity on the various instructional levels this year.

Of the 555 pupils for whom total pre and post scores could be compared 433 or 78% improved one or more Scale levels. Although 122 or 22% did not show a gain of an entire level it was interesting to note that a large percentage of this group were short of a full level gain by only one or two scale points. Of the 433 who had raised their levels 223 or 40% had raised their scores by one level, 168 or 30% by two levels, and 42 or 8% by at least three levels. These data are shown in Table 4.

TABLE 4

Improvement in English Competence
Based on
Pupil's Scores on the Scale of Ability to Speak English

School	N	No Level Achieved	One Level Achieved	Two Levels Achieved	Three Levels Achieved
Agassiz	36	4	14	16	2
Blackstone	46	-	35	11	0
Condon	50	-	-	27	23
Hennigan	51	4	8	38	1
Hernandez	45	18	22	5	0
Holland	48	5	30	12	1
Hurley	53	3	41	9	0
Kennedy	48	3	3	33	9
Kent	49	34	15	0	0
Mattahunt	41	19	4	12	6
Murphy	48	29	19	0	0
Tobin	40	3	32	5	0
Total N	555	122	223	168	42
Percent		22	40	30	8

THE JOHN TEST - MIDDLE-SCHOOL COMPONENT

One of the terminal objectives in the middle-school component was the improvement of proficiency in English as measured by pre-post test scores on the John Test of Oral Proficiency. The growth anticipated was a ten point gain based on the one-hundred point scale. The specific objective is stated below:

> Given approximately forty-five minutes of instruction five days per week for the school year, with no more than 11% absenteeism, each student will show an increase of ten points between the pre and post administration of the John Test, a Test of Oral Proficiency.

Data reported by the schools at the end of the year provided a total of 116 pre-post test scores that could be compared to determine the extent of program effectiveness in bringing about oral proficiency.

An analysis of pre-post test data for pupils on each of the three grade levels revealed an average gain of 34 points by those in grade six, 31 points by those in grade seven, and 33 points by those in grade eight. Gains by grades are shown in Table 5.

An analysis of these data by schools showed the Taft School to have an average gain of 54 points, the Edison School a gain of 22 points, and the Dearborn School an average gain of 20 points.

The program-wide average gain of 33 points was far in excess of the ten point gain which had been set as the objective. Gains by schools and for the program are presented in Table 6.

TABLE 5

The Middle School - The John Test

Improvement in English Oral Proficiency
By Grade Levels

Grade 6 School	N	Average Rating Pre	Post	Average Gain	Normal Curve Equiv. Pre	Post
Dearborn	15	540	711			
Edison	10	411	597			
Taft	22	462	1728			
Totals	47	1413	3036			
Program Aver.		31	65	34	39.6	58.1
Grade 7						
Dearborn	14	386	743			
Edison	8	303	522			
Taft	9	371	746			
Totals	31	1060	2011			
Program Aver.		34	65	31	41.3	58.1
Grade 8						
Dearborn	9	243	499			
Edison	18	702	1077			
Taft	11	278	906			
Totals	38	1223	2482			
Program Aver.		32	65	33	40.1	58.1
Program Totals	116	3696	7529			
Total Prog. Average		32	65	33	40.1	58.1

TABLE 6

The Middle School - The John Test

Improvement in English Oral Proficiency
By Program Schools

School	Grade	N	Average Score Pre	Post	Aver. Gain	Normal Curve Equiv. Pre	Post
Dearborn	6	15	540	711			
	7	14	386	743			
	8	9	243	499			
Totals		38	1169	1953			
Prog. Aver.			31	51	20	39.6	50.5
Edison	6	10	411	597			
	7	8	303	522			
	8	18	702	1077			
Totals		36	1416	2196			
Prog. Aver.			39	61	22	44.1	55.9
Taft	6	22	462	1728			
	7	9	371	746			
	8	11	278	906			
Totals		42	1111	3380			
Prog. Aver.			26	80	54	33.6	67.7
Total Program		116	3696	7529			
Total Prog. Aver.			32	65	33	40.1	58.1

PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES

Program pupils were tested at the beginning, during, and at the end of the program through the use of specially designed performance objectives prepared for the purpose of identifying oral-aural skills, placing pupils on appropriate levels of program instruction, and measuring growth and achievement. Placement was determined by the point at which one or more items were missed on a level and in consideration of scores achieved on the Scale of Ability to Speak English in the elementary component and on the John Test of Oral Proficiency in the middle school component. Advancement from one level to the next was to be based on one hundred percent achievement of the test items, or performance objectives, on the previous level. Performance objectives on each of the six elementary instructional levels, and on the four middle school levels were also used on an ongoing basis in determining areas in which concentrated instruction was needed, and in measuring growth both during and at the end of the program. Pupil performance by program component, level, and school is presented in tabular form with brief comments on the following pages.

Performance objectives for each of the levels in each component are presented in precis form before data for reader reference and convenience.

Level I

The pupil will be able to answer questions or respond within prescribed limits of accuracy concerning each of the following:

1. His/her name
2. His/her age
3. Following simple directions
4. Naming parts of the body
5. Counting to ten
6. Naming seven classroom objects
7. Naming three simple geometric shapes
8. Naming seven primary colors including black, white, brown
9. Naming ten common actions
10. Naming seven farm animals
11. Naming seven common toys
12. Naming six emotions
13. His/her address
14. Naming six different family members
15. Identification of classmates - simple introductions
16. Simple affirmative statements with the verb to be
17. Pronunciation: - identify, discriminate, and reproduce all vowel and consonant sounds
18. Intonation and stress in statements

Level II

The pupil will be able to answer questions or respond within prescribed limits of accuracy concerning each of the following using complete sentences where appropriate.

1. First and last position
2. Identify or name: Nine common foods
3. Seven common vehicles
4. Eleven common articles of clothing
5. Three common rooms in a house
6. Nine common household objects
7. Six community workers
8. Eight zoo animals
9. Five items in a table place setting
10. Days of the week in sequence
11. Seven different social expressions
12. Five locations relating to school and grounds
13. Ability to produce yes/no questions
14. Mastery of definative short answers
15. Use of present progressive tense
16. Use of the conjunction "and"
17. Correct usage of indefinite articles
18. Pronunciation: To identify, discriminate, reproduce vowel and consonant sounds as found in grammatical patterns taught on Level II.

Level III

1. Correct use of weather adjectives in response to questions (All)
2. Coins and coin value (4 out of 5)
3. Months of the year
4. Identification of 30 selected opposites
5. Seven ordinal numbers
6. Five common geometric shapes
7. Use of: conjunction "but" in describing opposite positions
8. possessive adjectives my, your, his, our, this
9. "Yes, I do" or "No, I don't"
10. negative short answers with "be"
11. "There is", "There are" to show singular and plural
12. possessive forms of nouns
13. expressions of place
14. demonstratives: This, That
15. prepositions
16. the modal "can"
17. Pronunciation: Identify, discriminate, and reproduce specified vowel and consonant sounds showing increased ability
18. Pronunciation: Intonation and stress - inflection at end of a yes-no question

Level IV

1. Naming of three of four seasons
2. recreational activities
3. six common signs- Stop, exit, danger, etc.
4. dates of year by month, day, year
5. nine of twelve months in sequence
6. Use of possessive pronouns - his/hers, yours/mine
7. Use of: present and past tense of "to be"
8. Use of: future tense of "to be"
9. comparisons - Positive and Comparitive
10. Production of informal questions "who and what"
11. Determiners of "some" and "any"
12. Affirmative and negative short answers with verb "to be"
13. Correct use of: prepositions
14. demonstratives
15. preposition of descriptive adjectives
16. Affirmative statements - simple present tense
17. Identify, discriminate, reproduce all of vowel and consonant sounds as found in gramatical patterns taught at Level IV
18. Intonation and stress in "Wh" questions as related to grammatical patterns taught at Level IV

Level V

1. Demonstrate understanding of eight months of the year
2. Identification of: six selected opposites
3. nine common occupations
4. ten places in the community
5. Following five directions on work sheets
6. Language structure - word order - expressions of time
7. Possessive Pronouns - Ours, Theirs
8. Polite requests - Affirmative and negative forms
9. Making comparisons

10. The future with "going to"
11. Information questions in the past - Who. Where, When
12. Nagative statements with the verb "to be"
13. Negative and affirmative short answers
14. Some and Any with Count and Mass Nouns
15. Affirmative and negative short answers with Do, Does, Don't, Doesn't
16. Adverbs - Appropriate behavior in public places (Library, etc.)
17. n Pronunciation: - Identify, discriminate, and produce vowel and consonant sounds as found in gramatical patterns taught at Level V. (Gain of automatic control of vowel and consonant sounds.)
18. Shifting of stress for contrast and emphasis - stressing key syllables

Level VI

1. Synonyms - Choice of words
2. Reading of numbers - 1 to 100
3. Correct use of mathematics vocabulary
4. Appropriate names of stores and businesses
5. Transitive verbs - Present tense
6. Word order - Complex sentences with two prepositional phrases of location
7. Irregular plurals
8. Review of tenses - Future, present, present progressive, past
9. Past tense - Irregular verbs
10. Expressions of place and time
11. Clock time - half past, quarter to, quarter past, etc.
12. Verbs followed by two complements - Me, Them, Him, Her, Us, It.
13. Correct use of: Function words: Modals Can, Should
14. The "marked" infinitive
15. Conditional tense
16. Negative statements with don't and doesn't - correct transformations
17. Sound System - Pronunciation - Identify, discriminate, reproduce all vowel and consonant sounds in spontanious conversation - automatic control of English consonant and vowel sounds
18. Intonation and stress in "or" questions using grammatical patterns taught at Level V.

Elementary Component - Achievement of Objectives

In the elementary component 77% of the objectives that had been established for the component and which were covered during instruction were achieved by the pupils who had pursued them on their appropriate levels. Only two schools reported instruction on level five where content related to nine objectives was covered. No school reported instruction on level six. According to data provided, the highest achievement attained was on level one where 88% of the objectives were mastered. Levels two, five, and three followed with 77%, 73%, and 70% respectively. Objectives for level four were achieved by a smaller percentage than those for the other levels showing only 55% mastery. Overall achievement in percentages and by levels is shown in Table 7.

TABLE 7

Achievement of Performance Objectives

Elementary Component

Level of Instruction	Pupils at Level	Actual Achievement Totals	Possible Achievement Totals	Percentage of Achievement
1	367	5803	6606	88
2	406	5592	7308	77
3	211	2646	3798	70
4	79	775	1422	55
5	15	99	135	73
6	0	-	-	-
Totals		14915	19269	77

*It should be noted that during the course of the year many pupils progressed from one to another level and that the recording of this progress in terms of performance objective mastery resulted in many being listed more than one time and in the total number of pupils in the above table being larger than actual enrollment

Elementary Component - Achievement of Objectives by Levels

The achievement of objectives by levels has been tabulated and presented in Tables 8 through 12. Under each of the objectives the number of pupils who successfully completed it in each school is given. The total number of pupils in the program completing each objective is shown at the bottom of tables along with percentages of achievement. It should again be noted that only two schools reported instruction on level five and that on this level content related to only nine of the objectives were covered by teachers. No school reported instruction on level six.

TABLE 8

Achievement of Performance Objectives
Elementary Component

Level 1

Program School	N	Performance Objectives																	
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
Agassiz	42	33	33	22	24	24	24	28	26	25	25	21	23	27	22	21	22	21	22
Blackstone	46	46	46	46	46	46	46	46	46	46	46	46	46	46	46	46	46	46	46
Condon	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50
Kent	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hennigan	37	37	37	37	37	37	37	37	37	37	37	37	37	37	37	37	37	37	37
Hernandez	27	26	26	25	26	26	25	25	23	22	22	21	21	20	25	25	25	25	25
Holland	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hurley	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	11	12	10	7	9	10	7	10	10	10	10	9
Kennedy	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	37	37	37	37	37	37	37	37	37
Mattahunt	19	17	15	17	17	17	17	15	15	17	16	15	4	6	12	5	7	6	1
Murphy	50	50	50	50	48	50	48	41	49	45	46	46	44	45	46	27	46	44	44
Tobin	40	40	40	40	38	34	29	33	38	27	33	29	31	34	39	25	29	26	26
Totals	367	355	353	343	342	340	332	326	336	319	319	311	303	309	324	283	309	302	297
Percent Achieving Objective		97	96	93	93	93	90	89	92	87	87	85	83	84	88	77	84	82	81

TABLE 9

Achievement of Performance Objectives
Elementary Component

Level 2

Program School	N	Performance Objectives																	
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
Agassiz	27	25	22	22	22	22	20	19	20	13	8	6	6	6	6	5	5	5	5
Blackstone	46	46	46	46	46	46	46	46	46	36	34	44	36	45	33	46	46	34	33
Condon	50	26	28	29	22	27	22	21	23	26	19	11	20	19	11	23	17	4	1
Kent	13	11	12	12	11	12	12	11	11	10	3	10	10	12	2	13	11	11	9
Hennigan	42	42	42	42	42	42	39	42	42	35	36	37	32	39	41	32	29	36	31
Hernandez	46	44	44	42	42	42	42	42	40	41	40	37	37	37	37	37	37	37	37
Holland	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	0	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hurley	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	13	13	12	9	10	14	9	14	11	14	14	10
Kennedy	45	45	45	45	45	45	45	45	43	41	42	44	33	41	40	43	43	19	42
Mattahunt	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	0	4	4	4	4	4
Murphy	45	45	44	45	45	43	42	44	42	44	43	44	43	42	41	42	42	42	43
Tobin	44	42	43	38	40	40	25	40	34	37	36	37	35	28	19	18	17	17	17
Totals	406	374	374	369	363	367	341	357	348	329	266	314	270	278	248	274	265	223	232
Percent Achieving Objective		92	92	91	89	90	84	88	86	81	66	77	67	68	61	67	65	55	57

TABLE 10

Achievement of Performance Objectives
Elementary Component

Level 3

Program School	N	Performance Objectives																	
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
Agassiz	7	5	5	5	4	5	6	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Blackstone	20	18	18	19	19	18	18	9	18	19	17	18	15	18	19	16	15	13	13
Condon	30	20	20	20	12	20	23	15	17	20	15	10	2	17	17	9	8	2	2
Kent	25	7	17	13	22	7	7	24	1	4	7	1	1	0	1	0	9	0	0
Hennigan	25	25	25	21	19	18	25	12	12	14	12	3	4	9	5	17	17	6	6
Hernandez	24	24	24	24	24	24	24	24	24	22	22	20	20	22	22	22	21	22	22
Holland	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hurley	20	20	20	20	20	20	19	19	19	19	18	19	20	20	17	16	17	20	20
Kennedy	19	19	9	19	19	19	19	19	19	9	9	9	9	19	9	9	9	9	9
Mattahunt	12	12	12	11	8	12	12	8	10	11	12	11	11	10	7	11	12	10	11
Murphy	18	16	17	18	14	15	2	12	7	13	11	9	11	14	7	15	12	9	9
Tobin	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12
Totals	211	185	186	189	180	177	174	163	148	152	137	114	107	143	118	129	134	105	105
Percent Achieving Objective		84	85	86	82	81	79	74	68	69	63	52	49	65	54	59	61	48	48

TABLE 11

Achievement of Performance Objectives
Elementary Component

Level 4

Program School	N	Performance Objectives																	
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
Blackstone	11	11	11	0	0	2	11	0	0	0	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	0	0
Kent	11	11	10	11	11	11	10	2	5	11	0	6	5	11	9	11	11	4	6
Hennigan	4	4	4	4	4	4	2	2	1	4	2	4	3	3	2	1	0	1	1
Hernandez	21	21	21	19	19	19	17	20	20	3	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Holland	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kennedy	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9
Mattahunt	6	4	4	3	3	3	3	0	2	4	3	4	3	0	1	4	1	0	0
Tobin	12	12	0	12	0	12	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Totals	79	77	76	63	51	65	69	38	42	36	28	35	31	34	32	36	32	14	16
Percent Achieving Objective		97	96	80	65	82	87	48	53	46	35	44	39	43	41	46	41	18	20

TABLE 12

Achievement of Performance Objectives
Elementary Component

Level 5

Program School	N	Performance Objectives																	
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
Holland	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kennedy	9	9	9	9	0	0	9	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Totals	15	15	15	15	6	6	15	6	6	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Percent		100	100	100	40	40	100	40	40	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Middle-School Component - The Objectives

The performance objectives for each of the four middle-school component levels are presented on the following pages in prebis form for the convenience of the reader in referring to the general content of specific objectives

Level I

The pupil will be able to answer questions or respond within prescribed limits of accuracy concerning each of the following:

1. Personal pronouns - with verb "to be"
2. Indefinite article - a/an
3. Present tense - verb "to be"
4. Regular plurals - selection of correct regular plural nouns
5. Conjunction - and
6. Yes/no questions with verb "to be"
7. Negatives with verb "to be"
8. Adjectives with verb "to be"
9. Adjectives before nouns - selection ofcorrect placement
10. Demonstratives - this, that, these, those
11. Regular and irregular plural noun forms - correct plural forms
12. Action verbs - present tense
13. Action verbs - yes/no questions
14. Action verbs - negatives - contracted forms of auxiliaries do/does

Language Structures - Vocabulary - Level 1

15. Selection of word which best completes sentence relating to basic adjectives. Greetings - responses Farewells - responses
16. Selection of word which best completes sentence relating to basic adjectives. Introductions - use of titles
17. Selection of word which best completes sentence relating to basic adjectives related to classroom objects, materials, attitudes, etc.
18. Selection of word which best completes sentence relating to basic adjectives. Youngest - oldest: nouns - family members
19. Selection of word which best completes sentence relating to basic adjectives. Cardinal numbers - one to one thousand
20. Selection of word which best completes sentence relating to basic adjectives. Nouns - parts of the body
21. Selection of word which best completes sentence relating to basic adjectives. Nouns - articles of clothing and jewelry
22. Selection of word which best completes sentence relating to basic adjectives. Colors, size, hardness, direction, quality, etc.
23. Selection of word which best completes sentence relating to school environment.- Personnel, rooms, areas. etc.
24. Selection of word which best completes sentence relating to days of week - past, present, future
25. Selection of word which best completes sentence relating to transportation. - Land, sea, air vehicles
26. Selection of word which best completes sentence relating to basic adjectives. Nouns - house, farm, and zoo animals
27. The sound system - Pronunciation - Reproduction of all vowel and consonant sounds as found in grammatical patterns, dialogues, minimum pair drills, and oral poems treated at level 1.

Level II

Language Structures -

1. Selection of correct tag question - present tense of verb "to be". be, present, aren't you? etc.
2. Selection of correct adverbs of frequency. Always, sometimes, etc.
3. Selection of correct imperative form of verb to match subject of sentence. Imperatives, requests
4. Selection of correct adverbs of pace. Fast, slowly, etc.
5. Selection of appropriate prepositional form. Of, with, to -
6. Selection of correct or appropriate adverbials of means. By plane, in a taxi, etc.
7. Selection of correct possessive adjectives. My, your, etc.
8. Selection of correct possessive forms of the noun. Roger's, top of the table, etc.
9. Selection of correct prepositions. In, on, at, etc.
10. Selection of correct interrogative pronouns. Who, what, when, where, why, how, which.
11. Selection of correct possessive pronouns. Mine, yours, ours, etc.
12. Selection of correct and appropriate cardinal numbers.
13. Selection of appropriate time/weather terms or expressions. Expletive it, eg. it's cold
14. Selection of correct and appropriate forms of expletives. There is, There are
15. Selection of correct and appropriate countable and uncountable nouns. Cheese, books, etc.
16. Selection of correct form of some, any, none, etc.

Vocabulary Directions Level II

17. Demonstration of ability to follow oral or written directions.
    Examples: (Verbs) To open, to close. to repeat, to pronounce, to practice, to answer, to understand. (Idioms-directions) Sit down, think of, to catch on, figure out, to do over, etc.

Basic Adjectives

18. Demonstration of mastery of vocabulary usage through selection of appropriate basic or collective adjectives. (Basic) Hot, cold, front, back, dark, light, free, famous, etc. (Collective) Any, all, both, another, several, many, few, etc.

Rooms of a House

19. Demonstration of ability to correctly label pictures having illustrations relating to rooms of a house. Examples:
    Bathroom. - Sink, medicine, toilet paper, shower, etc.
    To take a bath, to take a shower, etc
    Bedroom. - Bed, bureau, sheets. blankets, table lamp, etc.
    To make a bed, to tidy up, to go to bed, etc.
    Living room. - Sofa, coffee table, carpet, doorway, etc.
    Warm, clean, dirty, modern, etc.
    Kitchen. - Stove, oven, coffee pot, closet, detergent, etc.
    Greasy, hot, cold, etc. To make dinner, to clean up,

Calendar related words

20. Demonstration of mastery of words related to a calendar. Examples:
    Nouns. - month, year, century, January, April, eve, spring, etc.
    Expressions - In a week/ month/ year, within a week/ month/ year, the day before/ after, all day Monday/ Tuesday/Wed. etc.

Home Activities

21. Demonstration of mastery of words related to activities that take place in a room or area of a house. Examples:
Kitchen: To wash dishes, to cook a meal, to eat, etc.
Bathroom: To shower, to shave, to take a bath, etc.
Living room: To entertain, to dust, to talk, to relax, etc.
Bedroom: To take a nap, to sleep, to change, etc.
Dining room: To eat, to dine, etc. Den: To read, to study, etc.
Hall: To walk, to run, etc. Attic: To store,etc.

Telling Time

22. Demonstration of mastery of words relating to telling time. Examples:
Nouns: Clock, second hand, second, minute, hour, noon, evening, etc.
Expressions: In the morning, in the evening, at noon, in an hour, all day long, after midnight, at sunrise, etc.

Weather

23. Demonstration of mastery of words relating to weather. Examples:
Adjectives: Cloudy, sunny snowy, fine, clear, overcast, humid, etc.

Basic Verbs

24. Demonstration of mastery of basic verbs. Examples: Have, say, give, open, wrote, help, close, start, want, need, play, add, turn, eat, happen, call, rest, build, explain, pass, travel, etc.

Food

25. Demonstration of mastery of words or names given to foods. Examples:
Nouns: Beef, hot dogs, steak, liver, lamb, veal, pork, etc.
Fish, shrimp, tuna, clams, etc. Chicken, duck, etc.
Candy, candy bar, gum, pie, ice cream. cake, etc.
Rolls, bread, pancakes, etc. Cheese, eggs, milk, etc.
Salt, pepper, catsup, spice, etc. Potatoes, beans, etc.

The Sound System

Pronunciation:

26. Demonstration of ability to identify, discriminate, and reproduce all of the vowel and consonant sounds as found in grammatical patterns, dialogues, minimum pair drills, and oral poems treated at level 2.

Intonation and Stress

27. Demonstration of ability to produce correct intonation and stress in statements using grammatical patterns taught at level 2.
Sample patterns: This is a BALL. This is a PENCIL. This is a TOP.

Level III

Language Structures

The student will demonstrate ability to select correct:

1. Expression of "how much" or "how many" from several choices
2. Simple past tense forms of verb "to be"
3. Past tense of regular verbs in specific sentences
4. Past tense of regular verbs in negative mode

5. Examples of object pronouns
6. Direct or indirect object in appropriate structural position
7. Adverbs of manner
8. Adjectives in the positive, comparative, and superlative degrees
9. Past continuous tense form of familiar verbs
10. Present continuous and simple present verb forms
11. Future tense forms of "going to"
12. Choice of "like to", "want to", "have to"

Vocabulary

The student will demonstrate ability to select correct:

13. Basic prepositions (from given list) to complete sample sentences
14. Basic adverbs (from given list) to complete sample sentences
15. Basic nouns (from given list) to complete "neighborhood" sentences
16. Basic nouns (from given list) to complete "career"sentences
17. Nouns, adjectives, or idioms/verbs (from given list) to complete sentences relating to public transportation
18. Nouns, adjectives, verbs (from given list) to complete sentences relating to street directions
19. Day name, title, or description (from given list) to complete sentences about holidays
20. Word or phrase to complete sentences about opposites
21. Nouns, verbs, or adjectives (from given list) to complete sentences about emotions
22. Nouns or verbs (from given list) to complete sentences about money
23. Ordinal numbers to best complete sample sentences

Pronunciation

The student will demonstrate ability to:

24. Identify, discriminate, and reproduce vowel and consonant sounds as found in grade 3 grammatical patterns, dialogues, minimum pair drills, and oral poems
25. Produce correct intonation and srtess in yes-no questions using grammatical patterns as taught at Level III

Level IV

Language Structures

The student will demonstrate ability to select correct:

1. Modal auxiliaries in given specific sentences (can, might, must,etc.)
2. Pronoun one or ones in specific sentences
3. Form of some/other/another before specific nouns in sample sentences
4. Future tense form (will) in specific sentences
5. Verb-to-verb (verb+infinitive) structure in sample sentences
6. Structure (and...too, and... either) in specific sentences
7. Reflexive pronouns in specific sentences (myself, himself, themselves)
8. Subordinate conjunctions to complete specific sentences
9. Subordinate time clauses to fit meanings of specific sentences (since, until, as soon as, etc.)
10. Relative pronouns to match noun/nouns which precede them in sentences
11. Intensifying adverbs (in appropriate position) to complete sentences
12. Verbs in present continuous tense in example sentences
13. Verbs in present perfect tense
14. Adverbs to provide appropriate meaning to example sentences

15. Embedded statements to complete example sentences
16. Adjectives + infinitive structures to complete example sentences
17. Tag endings for specific sentences (isn't she, wasn't he, etc.)

Vocabulary

The student will demonstrate ability to select correct:

18. Nouns and verbs to complete sentences relating to entertainment (given sample sentences and word list)
19. Nouns and verbs to complete sentences relating to sports (given sample sentences and word list)
20. Nouns to complete sentences relating to personal data (given sample sentences and word list)
21. Nouns, adjectives, noun/adjectives to complete sentences relating to physical appearance (given sample sentences and word list)
22. Nouns and adjectives to complete sentences relating to a department store (given sample sentences and word list)
23. Nouns, verbs, adjectives, expressions to complete sentences relating to meals and menus (given sample sentences and word list)

Pronunciation

24. The student will demonstrate ability to identify, discriminate, and reproduce all of the vowel and consonant sounds as found in grammatical patterns, dialogues, minimum pair drills, and oral poems treated on Level IV
25. The student will produce correct intonation and stress in "wh" questions as seen by his/her pronunciation of grammatical patterns treated on Level IV

Middle-School Component - Achievement of Objectives

According to a tabulation of the data provided by teachers in the middle-school component 84% of the objectives for which instruction was given were mastered. The highest achievement was recorded on level three with 93% mastery and the lowest for level one which attained 79% of these objectives. Levels two and four were almost parallel in achievement with 87% and 89% respectively. These percentages on levels three and four however do not appear to be meaningful on a program wide basis because of the small numbers of participating pupils.

Percentages of achievement were computed only for those objectives which were treated during instruction. The Edison School reported instruction on all four levels while the Taft School reported instruction on levels one, two, and three but not on four. The Dearborn School reported instruction only on level one. Overall achievement is presented in Table 17.

Middle School Component - Achievement of Objectives by Levels

Achievement by levels has been presented in Table 13 through 16. Under each objective the number of pupils who successfully the objective is given. At the bottom of each table the total number of pupils completing each objective and the resulting percentage is provided.

TABLE 13
Achievement of Performance Objectives
Middle School Component

Level 1

Program School	N	Performance Objectives																								
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25
Dearborn	45	45	44	42	40	32	35	34	39	35	30	38	35	34	21	45	45	30	0	24	37	38	40	37	41	37
Edison	14	14	14	13	13	9	13	13	13	9	9	13	13	13	13	13	13	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9
Taft	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Totals	60	60	59	56	54	42	49	48	53	45	40	52	49	48	35	59	59	40	10	34	47	48	50	47	51	47
Percent Achieving Objective		100	98	93	90	70	82	80	88	75	67	87	82	80	58	98	98	67	17	57	78	80	83	78	85	78

TABLE 14
Achievement of Performance Objectives
Middle School Component

Level 2

Program School	N	Performance Objectives																								
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25
Edison	25	25	25	0	0	0	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	0	0	25	0	25	25	25	25	25	0	25	25	25
Taft	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30
Totals	55	55	55	30	30	30	55	55	55	55	55	55	55	30	30	55	30	55	55	55	55	55	30	55	55	55
Percent Achieving Objective		100	100	55	55	55	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	55	55	100	55	100	100	100	100	100	55	100	100	100

TABLE 15
Achievement of Performance Objectives
Middle School Component

Level 3

Program School	N	Performance Objectives																								
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25
Edison	8	8	8	8	8	8	6	6	6	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
Taft	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8
Totals	16	16	16	16	16	16	14	14	14	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14
Percent		100	100	100	100	100	88	88	88	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	88	88	88	88	88	88	88	88	88	88

TABLE 16

Achievement of Performance Objectives
Middle School Component

Level 4

N = 6

School: Thomas A. Edison

Performance Objectives

School	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25
Edison	4	6	6	6	6	4	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	4	0	6	6	6	6	6	6	4	4	6	6

Percentages: 100% Mastery - Objectives: 2-5, 7-13, 16-21, 24,25
67% Mastery - Objectives: 1,6,14,22,23
0% Mastery - Objective: 15

TABLE 17

Achievement of Performance Objectives
Middle School Component

All Levels

Level of Instruction	Pupils at Level	Actual Achievement Totals	Possible Achievement Totals	Percentage of Achievement
1	60	1182	1500	79
2	55	1200	1375	87
3	16	374	400	93
4	6	134	150	89
Totals		2890	3425	84

CHAPTER 4

OVERALL SUMMARY AND APPRAISAL

The Boston 1981-82 Title I English as a Second Language Program was fully implemented administratively in terms of the budgetary restrictions placed upon it and the personnel limitations which were imposed. Educationally its effectiveness, in the opinion of the evaluators, was diminished because the restrictions and limitations imposed were unsound and resulted in a weakened program which met its objectives because of its well established structure.

Not only had a reduction in the program teaching and supportive personnel been brought about by these program modifications, but changes in teacher assignments had caused a 75% turnover in the program's teaching staff. Although experienced, only five of the fifteen teachers assigned had background, training, or experience in this instructional area. An experienced program coordinator working under the administrative direction of the Department of Title I Programs and the Title I Office of Research and Evaluation, and assisted in program supervision by administrators in each of the schools provided direction, individual help, and in-service training to the program staff. The staff as a whole remained stable throughout the year. A single field community coordinator served as liason agent between schools and communities in Boston in an attempt to remedy adjustment problems of the 710 to 715 program pupils.

Twelve elementary and three middle-school buildings, where in most instances ample program supplies and materials were available from previous ESL programs, were used as centers for program instruction. Schools and rooms used for instruction were found to be satisfactory, good, or excellent with reference to conditions for learning.

Pupil selection and placement was implemented early in the year in the large majority of schools according to basic criteria specifically established for the program. Enrollment on the elementary level ranged from 583 to 599 and on the middle-school level from 128 to 131 resulting in a program average enrollment of from 710 to 715 at different times of the year. In all, including pupils lost through transfer, the program served 806 pupils at one time or another during the year. Information provided by teachers indicated a 12% transfer or discharge rate. (May total enrollment = 711, discharges September through May - 95) Pupil attendance records revealed a generally stable pupil population throughout the year however.

Instructional methods were found to vary from school to school from a strictly formal approach to highly individualized activity. The fact that program teachers were not only inexperienced in this area but did not have aides, however, seemed to limit the amount of small group and individual instruction as well as creative activity. Observation and interview findings revealed a general reliance on the program performance objective structure and program materials as a basis for both instructional content and approach. In most classrooms it was apparent that teachers new to the program needed assistance in planning, the use of ESL linguistic techniques, and appropriate methodology as well as testing procedures. Although outstanding instructional procedures were noted during many observations these procedures did not seem to be program wide.

Lesson plans examined had, in the majority, been developed as guides or weekly plans rather than plans for specific lessons or for use in the treatment of diagnosed individual pupil needs. Most plans were designed for use with entire class groups rather than for group, subgroup, and individual work. There was little evidence of grouping within classes during observations. Once again it appeared that a strong program structure made it possible for instructional procedures to be effective although planning and ESL methodology seemed to be weak and to need direction.

Although planning for individual instruction appeared to be weak, systematic procedures developed by the Title I Office of Research and Evaluation routinized the ongoing recording of enrollment, attendance, and achievement data for each pupil and the reporting of these data at mid year and late in May. Instruction in the use of specially prepared and relatively simple data sheets was provided at the beginning of the year and during the course of coordinator visits however teachers new to the program in many instances appeared to be overwhelmed by paper work. Record keeping skills, including neatness and legibility, seemed to present a problem to many teachers and records maintained by teachers for their own use seemed to lack uniformity and system.

In keeping with Title I ESL practices, individual progress and confidential folders were maintained for each child by program teachers and were used as motivational aids and as instructional tools. Those experienced in the program appeared to use them to the greatest advantage. Analysis of observation findings indicated a need on the part of many teachers, particularly those unacquainted with program record keeping procedures, for concentrated in-service training in this area.

Interviews with school administrators indicated that the majority were of the opinion that the program had started on time in their schools with an experienced and qualified staff. Central office support and small class size allowing for small group and individualized instruction were considered to be the program's greatest strengths. Many however, expressed the opinion that there should be more time allotted to the study of English. Final interview responses indicated that most believed that the program had achieved its goals and attributed this to to the program structure, tie-in with bilingual education, and an abundance of program materials. Program insecurity and the need for additional teachers were regarded as major weaknesses. Some also expressed the opinion that the need for additional teachers, and guide line ratios, had made it impossible to serve all pupils who needed program assistance. Principal accomplishments were considered to be the adjustment of pupils, the development of communication skills, and the rate of pupil achievement. All praised the program's well established structure and recommended the elimination of program uncertainty and the program's continuation.

Interviews with teachers indicated a basically smooth beginning of the year for most although some difficulty was experienced because of a "mix up" in teacher assignments, the need to learn a new program, limited materials, and difficulty in getting pupils released from regular classes. Teachers new to the program appeared to understand the general objectives and thrust of the program and said that they had adjusted to program routines and materials with the aid of the well established program preformance objectives and materials as guidelines. Most said that they believed the program's major objectives had been accomplished.

It was suggested that teachers new to the program either take, or be given, time to study readily availabe program materials at the beginning of the year, learn the materials, and strictly follow the program structure. Additional training in planning, methods, testing, and the sharing of ideas through workshops was suggested as a means of improving teaching skills. It was also suggested that care be exercised in the selection and placement of pupils, that there be greater teacher input in the selection and placement process, and that instruction in English be intensified. The principal accomplishments of the program according to the teachers was the adjustment of pupils and the development of communication skills. Program uncertainty and instability caused by budget changes, and changes in program staff assignments were considered to be major nagative factors.

Questionnaire responses of school administrators substantiated observation and interview findings. According to responses neither pupil mobility nor community tensions had been disruptive factors during the year although parent involvement in the program was reported to be low. General satisfaction was indicated regarding teacher performance and attendance as well as for program services provided by the Title I office. Although responses pointed out the failure of the program to provide instruction for all who needed it because of its limited size it was said that it had met the needs of the children it had been able to serve. It was suggested that teachers be assigned to schools in relation to the needs of the schools and that the same teachers be maintained from year to year.

A large majority of questionnaire responses of teachers indicated stable enrollment and attendance, satisfactory supplies and materials, and helpful in-service training. Suggestions for improving the training included assistance in lesson planning, record keeping, program implementation, and in procedures for measuring pupil needs and achievement. Most were also of the opinion that the program's broad objectives had been achieved and that the atmosphere the program encouraged were its strengths. Weaknesses according to respondents were related to teacher turnover, the small size of the program, and the negative attitudes of some non-ESL teachers.

Although instructional procedures and climate appeared to be restricted by factors beyond the control of program administrators and staff, program achievement goals were, on the basis of data reported, achieved. The assessment of program success was based largely on the extent to which performance objectives were mastered on each of the instructional levels of the two program components. In the elementary component 77% of the objectives, for which instruction was given on five of the six instructional levels, were mastered with level one achieving 88% mastery and levels two 77%, three 70% four 55% and five 73%. Level five had only fifteen pupils who had been instructed on nine of the fifteen objectives for that level. No pupils were reported to have worked on level six. On the elementary levels 583 pupils were served.

In the middle schools 128 pupils received instruction. Data concerning the achievement of middle school objectives for which instruction was given showed an overall mastery of 84% on four instructional levels. Pupils on level one achieved 79%, level two 87%, level three 93%, and level four 89%. Instruction on levels three and four however was provided to only 16 and 6 pupils respectively.

As an additional measure of success in the elementary component, pre-post test scores on the New York Scale of Ability to Speak English were compared. Of the 555 pupils for whom pre-post scores on the Scale could be compared 433 or 78% improved one grade or more indicating a satisfactory degree of program success but not meeting the goal of one grade or level of increase for each child. Of the 433 who did achieve one or more levels however 223 or 40% raised their scores by one level, 168 or 30% by two levels, and 42 or 8% by three levels.

On the middle school level a comparison of pre-post scores on the John Test of Oral Proficiency was made. This comparison showed an overall gain of 33% in achievement on the 100 point scale. This far exceeded the broad component goal of ten points or 10%.

Concluding Statement. During the current evaluation it appeared that the program's strong momentum, resulting from fifteen years of carefully developed materials, excellent direction, and a well established approach, made it possible for the program to be implemented smoothly, contribute to pupil adjustment, develop communication skills of children, and to attain various program goals. Although satisfaction with the program was expressed by teachers and administrators alike it was clearly recognized that the program had been weakened not only by a reduction in staff but by the assignment of teachers unprepared in the techniques of ESL instruction. The burden of training teachers in this specialized area was obviously increased as a result of the reassignment of teachers. The data and information presented in this report substantiates the need for program stabilization at this point.

As a result of their experience in the program during the current year most teachers have developed knowledge of the area and appropriate instructional techniques however end of year interviews revealed that the majority of these teachers, and the program coordinator, have been officially informed that they will not be assigned to the program for the coming 1982-83 school year.

With an increasing number of non-English speaking children and the need for the smooth transition of these children into our communication patterns and culture it would seem imperative that this program be expanded and stabilized.

Of the recommendations made in this report the evaluators regard the following to be most important.

> Conduct a series of top level administrator meetings to seriously consider the gravity of meeting the educational requirements of a growing non-English pupil population and the possible negative effects of failure to do so as well as for the purpose of reestablishing the administrative guidelines for the conduct of this program.
>
> Investigate, negotiate, and implement a procedure which would permit continued Title I ESL program teaching assignments for a majority of the staff. In the opinion of the evaluators the satisfaction of the educational needs and the adjustment of minority pupils served by this program through the use of skilled personnel should not be negated.
>
> Continue the assignment of a trained and experienced program coordinator and program teachers in order to maintain program structure. It is the opinion of the evaluators that this program cannot successfully discharge its educational obligations to the pupils and to the community without an established and ESL experienced teaching and coordinating staff of sufficient size to meet the needs of a growing non-English speaking pupil population.

CHAPTER 5

RECOMMENDATIONS

As a result of continued effort over the past fifteen years this program has developed a structure which has enabled it to withstand administrative and budgetary changes and constraints and to continue to provide E.S.L. instruction to non-English speaking pupils. These administrative and budgetary constraints now appear to have reached a point where the program seems, on the basis of this assessment, to have lost much of its strength and effectiveness as well as its ability to reach many children who might benefit from its offerings. It is with these factors in mind that the following recommendations are made. Some made previously are again offered for consideration.

1. Conduct a series of top level administrator meetings to seriously consider the gravity of meeting the educational requirements of a growing non-English speaking population and the possible negative effects of failure to do so as well as for the purpose of reestablishing the administrative guidelines for the conduct of this program.

2. Investigate, negotiate, and implement a procedure which would permit continued Title I ESL program teaching assignments for a majority of the staff. In the opinion of the evaluators the satisfaction of the educational needs and the adjustment of minority pupils served by this program through the use of skilled personnel should not be negated.

3. Conduct monthly in-service training meetings for all ESL teachers new to the program. It is essential that teachers new to the program be informed with reference to special techniques, methodologies, and procedures.

4. Conduct in-service workshops, when practicable, in classsooms where various innovative techniques or materials are displayed and which provide a stimulating and motivating atmosphere. In this way teachers new to the program may be inspired to try new approaches and materials and ideas may be shared.

5. Conduct in-service orientation on the use of Title I Office of Research and Evaluation data and statistical forms at a general staff meeting early in January in order to insure the systematic and accurate, as well as neat and legible, reporting of mid-year data. In this way errors found in mid-year reporting may be rectified and a uniformity of procedure for the remainder of the year can be established.

6. Provide for the preparation of individual bulletins on each of the various topics on which teachers need assistance. (Lesson planning, record keeping, testing, etc.) If these bulletins cannot be presented and reviewed at program workshops their availability alone should be helpful.

7. Continue efforts to establish and maintain a uniform but not rigid format for lesson plans. It is suggested that plans be developed on a daily basis with reference to on-going diagnosis of pupil growth and needs.

8. Continue to exert efforts toward the coordination of teaching programs of ESL and bilingual teachers in order to make it possible for teachers in these areas to confer regarding pupils for whom they share instructional responsibility. There continued to be a need for strengthened communication between ESL and bilingual teachers in some schools.

9. Reexamine selection and placement procedures particularly with reference to testing and testing materials. Investigate the need for revising New York Scale illustrations, the availability of other testing materials, and the practicality of using the Lau tests as selection instruments.

10. Provide for a teacher review of available instructional materials, and instruction on how these materials and alternate teacher made and teacher/pupil provided materials can be used on various levels and with different language groups. An examination of the abundance of available materials revealed many that could be adapted and used to advantage on each of the program's instructional levels.

11. Exert effort toward the involvement of both parents and community members in ESL programs through instructional culture related activities, visits and presentations by community figures to ESL classes, and visits of ESL classes to community libraries, offices, and markets.

12. Continue the assignment of a trained and experienced program coordinator and program teachers in order to maintain program structure. It is the opinion of the evaluators that this program cannot successfully discharge its educational obligations to the pupils and to the community without an established and ESL experienced teaching and coordinating staff of sufficient size to meet the needs of a growing non-English speaking pupil population.